UNITY.

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

VOL. IV. *CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 1, 1879.* No. 5.

Something better than "foreign missions" begins to engage the attention of religious meetings. The late Evangelical Alliance at Basle, discussing this subject, saw more to blame in a Christian than in a heathen nation, and passed resolutions emphatically rebuking the British opium trade in China. Dr. Schaff, writing to the *Independent*, calls the opium trade a "satanic chapter in the history of Great Britain," says "a heathen nation protests against the poison, and a Christian nation forces it upon them," and mourns that "heathen China, with its loud protest, should shame Christian England." To be sure the object of the Alliance and Dr. Schaff is to remove "one of the chief obstacles to the progress of Christianity in the East;" but a still better result may be the improvement of Christianity in the West.

It looks hopeful for the "Peace Society" and humanity when even Bismarck (as Dr. Busch reports him) laments: "What wide-spread misery have I not caused? In satisfying my ambition, I have made nobody happy. And what a number of people I have cast into misery! Without me three great wars would have been avoided; 80,000 men—nay, many more—would not have been killed, and such numbers of families, of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters and wives, would not have been plunged into mourning." In this connection and as sign of the humaner times, we may quote the following sentence from a leading New York daily: "As men learn more of Napoleon, smaller and smaller he grows." Remember, too, Herbert Spencer's indignant paragraphs about Napoleon. This hero of so many books is coming to stand in modern thought as no hero at all. Yet, some say morality is declining. Well, if the decline of morality means this growth of humaner sentiments, then let it decline!

During the present discussion about the relations of skepticism and crime, this fresh item from Italy should be noted: "The report of the Minister shows that during the past year more than 2,000 murders were committed, an average per million of population unequaled by any other country on the face of the globe. During the same time the number of ordinary robberies, burglaries, etc., is stated at 40,000; while there were 50,000 robberies accompanied with violence. In her long catalogue of crime, Italy stands without a peer." This from the land which has been lighted so long by the capitol of Christendom and credulity! If the old theology is so essential to morals, why should a nation into which it has been bred for a thousand years, murder so much more than skeptical people do? To tell the truth, Goldwin Smith's "moral interregnum" has not waited in Italy for the "collapse of religious belief," but has been there all the time. Pious people there, as fond of the Catholic church as Mr. Mallock himself, have still thought life not "worth living,"—that is, the life of other people. The church must not now take to itself all the credit of the "mere morality" it has so often decried. Morality has not all come through sermons about another world,—especially as these sermons have so often taught that morality has nothing to do with the fate in the next world. Morality has a life of its own, is interwoven with the growth and structure of society in this world, and will not perish with declining pew-rents.

We sometimes hear that orthodoxy no longer decries morality in the name of religion. But here it comes again. One of Dr. Tallmage's late sermons in England pictures "very moral people" coming to the gates of heaven, and being answered from within, "I never knew you." The Doctor, however, used the wrong text this time. It was not the "moral people," but just those who called Jesus, "Lord, Lord," and claimed to have "done many wonderful works" in his name, who heard the answer, "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

May UNITY properly extend its charity to welcome a word for cannibals? At the late meeting of the British Association, according to a foreign exchange, Comte de Brazza "entered upon a defence not exactly of cannibalism, but of the cannibal races inhabiting that part of Africa visited by him." Major Pinto spoke still more highly of

them, and "characterized them as brave, loyal and honorable, and said they were far higher in the social scale than the non-cannibal tribes by whom they were surrounded." Commander Cameron said "he had always regarded cannibalism as one of the first stages of civilization, and that man-eating men and women were found to enjoy a higher degree of culture than non-cannibal tribes." And Sir Rawson Rawson remarked that, "though we in England did not literally eat each other, we performed that operation in another way with less humanity and less feeling than the cannibal when eating his enemy." Most of this agrees with the general verdict, and E. B. Tylor has written that the "greatest excesses" of cannibalism are "found among high savage tribes or nations above the savage level." And when we consider that savages sometimes eat a man to honor him, and often to appropriate to themselves thereby his better qualities, perhaps we shall agree with Sir Rawson that cannibals may have more laudable motives than even Christians dining on each other's reputations at feasts of slander.

Time brings justice. England once kept Mr. Holyoake in jail six months for blasphemy. But to-day, Mr. Holyoake, still working in the same spirit of regard for the poor which inspired the so-called "blasphemy," is welcomed among us as an honored guest; his recent Sunday lecture in Cincinnati is noticed by the *Commercial* as "especially marked by its tone of kindness and its reverence for the divine brotherhood of man;" and Mr. Wendte, who presided at the lecture, said of it that "at no church in the city could any one that day have listened to a sermon stronger than it in its teachings of the Christian spirit." Mr. Holyoake keeps "Co-operation" entirely distinct from and opposed to Communism. He says: "Communism is merely a parasitic growth, a destroyer, a wild, aimless revolutionist. Co-operation, on the other hand, is the organization of forces; the *unite*, as the French would say; the relative strength of each so united that the strength of all becomes the strength of the individual;" and again that "without the moral qualities of justice, kindness and honesty, co-operation is impossible." He also informs us that "from the total amount of profit made by a true co-operative store, one-half per cent. is set apart as an educational fund. The reason is that co-operators cannot be made out of fools. Workmen have to be instructed in the art of association. The Rochdale store had a short time ago fourteen newsrooms. I believe it has now nineteen, beside libraries—one of them being of great magnitude."

Jacqueline Bosse, another French girl blessed with visits from the Virgin, has had to relinquish such company and glory. The Blessed Virgin's voice proved to be Jacqueline's own ventriloquism, and the girl was sent to the reformatory for six months.

Shall heathendom teach us religious liberty? In a recent proclamation, the king of Siam says: "Whoever is of the opinion that any particular religion is correct, let him hold to it as he pleases: the right and the wrong will be to the person who holds it."

A French Catholic priest claims to have discovered "the exact spot in the Red Sea" where Pharaoh's army went down, and appeals to Christendom for $60,000 to raise the relics and so end infidelity. Let one of the "chariot wheels" be deposited in the rooms of the Bible Society:—or would it be more proper to have Bishop Colenso stretched on it in mediæval fashion?

The American Board of Foreign Missions at its late meeting reported that it had, since its organization, expended about seventeen million dollars. We doubt not that the money has done much good in foreign lands, besides being (as Mr. Beecher justified the cause) very "improving to the Christians" who gave it.

Mr. Beecher has said it; that if Jesus should come again as he came before, he would be thought a "disgrace" in some meetings and "lukewarm" in others, and it is "doubtful whether he would be allowed to preach in one out of five of our pulpits." Here is part of the lecture-room talk which the *Christian Union* reports:

"Christ came without being accredited by the Rabbis; without the recognition of the schools; without having the indorsement of anybody in authority. He came alone, by himself; he had no outward credentials of any kind; but he taught with a purity and a depth which rebuked all the different known teachings, calling in question even the Old Testament; declaring that in it certain things that were wicked were allowed because the people could not do any better than they did at the time; rebuking even the chiefs of the nation, pointing out their sins, and criticising the lives of the Israelites who were attempting to live within the bounds of the covenants.

"Now, if he were to come into our midst in such an attitude, what kind of a reception would probably be accorded to him? I mean not by the poor and the outcast, but by the churches. What sort of chance would he have if he were to

go into the Presbyterian Church, the Lutheran Church, the Episcopalian Church, or any of the so-called orthodox churches? The first scrutiny that he would undergo would be doctrinal. He would be examined in the Catechism and in the Confession of Faith; and if he did not answer all the interrogatories right he would be set aside; he would not be received; he would be rejected. I think it doubtful whether he would be allowed to preach in one out of five of our pulpits; because if he did not oppose the views held by church people he would be so different from what their standards required a teacher to be that it probably would not be thought proper to authorize him to teach. If he were to go into churches where ordinances prevail and govern, it is not likely that he would be considered as a fair representative of Christian worship according to their highly organized statutory methods. The large spirituality of his nature; the freedom of his thought and expression; his liability to use instruments that were disapproved or to discard instruments that were approved,—this, I suppose, would very quickly bring him to disgrace among those who were very regular and set in their methods. If he were to go into the meetings of an enthusiastic body of men, and he was not aroused by their hymns and prayers, but maintained tranquility and equanimity, I think he would be regarded as lukewarm by the brethren; and although he might be tolerated, I think he would not be received."

President Angell reports 134 women in Michigan University—41 more than in the previous year, and says:

"After our nine-year experience in coeducation, we have become so accustomed to see women take up any kind of University work, carry it on successfully, graduate in good health, cause no embarrassment in the administration of the institution, and awaken no especial solicitude in the minds of their friends or of their teachers, that many of the theoretical discussions of coeducation by those who have had no opportunity to examine it carefully, read strangely to us here on the ground. It is a cause of sincere congratulation that, both in this country and in Europe, the opportunities for women to obtain as extended an education as men, are rapidly multiplying."

NEHUSHTAN.

R. L. H.

"And Hezekiah brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan" (a piece of brass).—2 Kings xviii., 4.

We have here an instance of the instinct of a true religious reformer. Hezekiah did not hesitate to call the dear idol of the people "a piece of brass." He was not afraid to be a destructionist in religion—a brave iconoclast. He brake their god in pieces. There is a great talk often now among liberal religionists against iconoclasm. Even the Rev. O. B. Frothingham says that the "days of destruction are past." There is a disposition to deal tenderly with errors and delusions. Many liberals denounce a plain destructionist, like Colonel Ingersoll, and preach against him with much vehement zeal. Many liberal preachers are very ambiguous concerning many dogmas that they believe to be erroneous. Many good Unitarians cling with much tenacity to the supernatural.

Now, this appears to me a very important weakness, and a great reason why the darkness of superstition is prolonged, and the glad day of more truth is kept back from millions of people. Many Liberals outside of "orthodox" churches blame such men as Beecher, Swing and Thomas for their inconsistency and ambiguity and their tenderness toward the old idols, while the accusers themselves are guilty of the very same inconsistency and ambiguity. Jesus was a very plain destructionist. So was Luther, so was Channing, so was Parker, so have all the strong old Unitarian giants been, so has Rev. O. B. Frothingham been, and all pronounced reformers. When any man feels sure that what the millions worship is only an idol, why should he hesitate to call it "Nehushtan," and do his very best to "break it in pieces?" Do these men who think that "the days of destruction are past," imagine that they have delivered the millions from the old nonsense? Verily, the destruction of idols in Christendom has only just commenced. The greatest part of demolishing delusions is yet to be done. Let any liberalist go to the largest religious congregations in the land, and he will soon awake out of his dream that the masses have given up their superstitions. I know well that the great popular preachers in England and America teach their hearers every Sunday to cling to the old superstitions. Let me give one instance out of hundreds: Recently, in Great Britain, at a large meeting of "orthodox" ministers, who had under consideration the hard times and wet harvest time in their country, every great and small preacher in that assembly taught that the stagnation in trade and wet weather were special, arbitrary, supernatural judgments of God upon the people of that country! The truth is, that liberal religionists have hardly commenced yet to do their great work of banishing superstition from the minds of the millions. O, for more earnestness, and courage, and plainness of speech to destroy such nonsensical delusions! I thank God night and day for Col. Ingersoll, and pray that a thousand such plain-spoken men would arise to clear people's minds from the old errors, and so prepare their souls to receive the great positive truths of religion.

God forbid that I should endorse all that Ingersoll utters. Yet when good liberalists like dear

Brother Sunderland and others, who have written and said so much about great errors in the Bible, go against Ingersoll for saying the same things in a plainer, more forcible and popular way, I could not help mourning for their inconsistency. I humbly think that the inconsistencies of liberals, and their half-and-half way of opposing delusions, and their transcendental ambiguity, make them so weak against the popular errors. Far be it from me to wish that our dear little UNITY would stoop to any coarse, irreverent way of destroying popular errors; yet I do pray for the day when it will be a more plain, hard smiter of popular idols, so that nobody can misunderstand its meaning.

Let us ever be humble, reverent, kind and considerate in our destructive, hardest blows on popular and venerable hallucinations. And let us have the *constructiveness* of the truth *chiefly* in view, "speaking the Truth in *Love*." Yet may we never hesitate to speak "the TRUTH," calling every brazen god "Nehushtan," and try to "break it in pieces." O, that our liberal ideas would be "like rabbits' ears," as Dr. Lyman Beecher used to say, easy for people to get hold of them! I heard of a man who was going to "speak in a plain, simple way," to little children in a Sunday-school, and began by telling them that "the Four Gospels are didactic." There is a great deal of something like that in much liberal preaching and literature, which the masses or "common people" cannot understand. But there is something that is even more puzzling than that, in much of our liberalism. I mean the "holy ambiguity" of mixing supernaturalism with naturalism in our treatment of religious subjects.

THE LIMITATIONS OF RADICALISM.

N. M. MANN.

Last spring, my youngest boy took a fancy to have a flower garden. I thought it might afford good exercise for him, and at once granted his request for the use of a neglected corner of the back yard. He went to work manfully, clearing the spot of weeds and bushes, digging out all the roots, and showing so much energy and determination that my conscience troubled me a little that I had not given him a better spot for his experiment. However, the work of preparation was soon over, and he had as fine a spot of ground as I could have given him. Considerable time was then spent in determining how it should be laid out. At first, he threw it into a flat rectangle; but that looked too much like an onion-bed to please him; then he gave it a hexagonal form, with little paths radiating from the center. By the time he had it nicely fixed in this fashion, he became convinced that the mound was a better form, and this involved so much work that it was quite late before he was ready for his plants. By the kindness of his friends who have conservatories, he secured enough very pretty things to furnish his mound; and though he set them without much order, it began to look as though he might have some blossoms. I watched them daily, and soon observed that they did not grow at all. On looking a little closer, it appeared that he had changed their positions, with some view to systematic arrangement. Next day I noticed they were changed again, and for two weeks he had them up almost every day. I discovered that he was gradually evolving a conception of a symmetrical mound of flowers, and, as his idea grew, he was rearranging his plants to conform to that conception. The exercise was good, but it was death to the plants.

From this I was led to reflect how much better the radical is suited to deal with ideas than with institutions. What one carries in one's own head may often be rooted up to advantage, but organizations, customs, laws, which have been long time in forming, will not bear this frequent overhauling. We cannot be too critical of what goes into our thought, or of what has gone into it. Our beliefs need to be frequently laid bare from the foundation. They need to be thoroughly examined, rather, to see if they have any foundation. There is no reason why we should not, upon reflection, change our minds on important as well as on trivial subjects. It is right, when a belief has been found fallacious, to cast it instantly aside, however fondly it has been cherished. It is right to embrace a new doctrine as soon as it is seen to be fairly established. But systems of society and government, ecclesiastical and educational institutions, are not to be thus summarily passed upon. Even though faulty, they are not to be superseded at a stroke. They have been too long in forming. Moreover, they have not been produced by a course of reasoning, and will not give way before a course of reasoning. Customs and institutions have another mode of development, and they have another mode of decline. We must own, too, that the unreasoning order of their development involves a higher wisdom than ours. No man, sitting down to conceive a world, would put into it a hundredth part of what we find in this world. He would leave out some of the more obvious sources of misery, and neglect to put in many of the hidden springs of joy; and the world thus

conceived, put to the working test, would soon generate infinitely more wretchedness than the actual world. The actual world has come about by a long process of selection and adaptation. It is not in all respects the best possible, but as a whole it is far better than it would be if any radical, or a congress of the wisest radicals on earth, had the fashioning of it, and were able to work revolutions at their pleasure.

It is one thing to have freedom and incisiveness of thinking, and quite another thing to have the freedom to apply all the results of this thinking to the reorganization of communities, churches, states. These things will not bear pulling up by the roots every day or every year. The uprooting of a church once in a century may be the destruction of it. The family relation cannot safely be much tampered with, even once in a thousand years. The existing order of things has come about from absolute necessities operating through immemorial ages, and is only to be modified in like manner as new necessities arise. Our radical reformers do not see the infinite conceit of flying in the face of a universal custom which does not happen to commend itself to their individual judgment, but such it certainly is. The individual judgment is a very inadequate criterion by which to try institutions thousands of years old. If by some miracle the power were given to me to work practical changes in the social machinery of the world wherever I deemed it best, I should shrink from greatly meddling with it, because I know that the existing order of civilization springs from causes deeper than my consciousness, and therefore is better suited to human needs than any new civilization which I might start.

The sensible attitude, it seems to me, is to be radical with reference to ideas, but rather conservative in respect to practical affairs. The hand which is quickest to impale a falsehood in the creed may hesitate longest to assail a questionable social regulation or a distasteful church observance. Concerning the statement in the creed, you have or can obtain all the evidence, and may be competent to pronounce upon it; but touching these other matters, you know, or ought to know, that you are not qualified to give a final decision. You cannot speak for mankind in matters of taste or practical needs.

Superficial knowledge often sets a bold thinker in the rash and ridiculous attitude of seeking to topple the world over. There is no special danger in this to the world, but the poor man frets and fumes his life away to little purpose. The common instinct which withdraws confidence from such a person is significant. In Church or in State, the pronounced radical is never placed in responsible positions. He is not reckoned a safe man. He is always running a tilt against something, if it be nothing more than a windmill. With these Quixotic antics the world has little patience.

There is a legitimate field of practical reform. But account must be taken of this principle: modification of customs and institutions can only be effected in conformity with the method of their growth.

CREMATION.

Dr. Le Moyne long lived derided for advocating abolition, and has now died derided for advocating cremation. Perhaps the latter cause is as likely to triumph as the former once was. Opponents of cremation rejoice that Dr. Le Moyne's is to be the last. But they ignore the history, universality, healthiness and fitness of the custom. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* tells us that, except in Egypt, China and Judæa, cremation was "the general practice of the ancient world," and is still practiced "over a great part of Asia and America." The ancient Jews used it in time of plague, and modern Jews at Berlin and elsewhere "have been among the first to welcome" it. Even the early Christians practiced it, and in the Roman Empire "to the end of the 4th Christian century, burning on the pyre was the general rule." But the doctrine of the resurrection of the body at length stopped the custom among Christians, and gave us the cemeteries, which sanitary science is so loudly denouncing today. Their unhealthiness has long been acknowledged and feared. Not only do the old cemeteries of Paris and other foreign towns spread disease, but those of our own Southern cities—especially of New Orleans—are said to be "not now so much resting-places for the dead as breeding-places of pestilence for the living."

Sanitary science finds itself opposed by religious sentiment. But surely this sentiment will correct itself on further thought. Even the old objection that the resurrection of the body forbade burning, was not satisfactory; for as Lord Shaftesbury said, "what would then become of the blessed martyrs?" Besides a burnt body is no more destroyed than a buried body. Fire does in a quick and cleanly way the same thing which putrefaction does in a long and loathsome way. Why all the cry has arisen against cremation, is hard to see. If most of us are to be consciously burned forever in the next world, why oppose so a painless burning

of an hour or two in this? But, seriously, cremation suggests less unpleasant thoughts than burial. To a refined view the rapid etherialization and sublimation by fire are far less repulsive than the foul decay of the grave. Nay, to take such pains to preserve a dead body shows a far less spiritual view of the soul than to commit the body to the flame, as if the real substance of our friend were something else, and not to be harmed at all by any fire.

So we must not think cremation has died with Dr. Le Moyne. In Europe the movement has been lately gaining many adherents among physicians and common people. The Berlin Municipal Council recommended it. In England even a clergyman, Mr. Haweis, has been conspicuously active in its behalf. And even in America, probably, as the New York *Tribune* declares, "already among our more educated, liberal classes, a large undeclared party are in favor of cremation."

THE GROWTH OF A NATION'S HOUSEHOLD WORD.

W. C. GANNETT.

"The Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." So said President Lincoln at the end of his Gettysburg address, and the place, the time, the man joined to make the phrase immortal. But even that place, time and man would not have made immortal any common phrase. "The Government of the people, by the people, for the people": not a thought there too little, not a syllable there too much. It has become one of the nation's household words,—*the* definition of Democracy. The war of Nationality sheathed itself in that phrase, somewhat as the war of Independence sheathed itself in the famous phrase about "all men created equal" and the "unalienable rights." The two phrases hang in memory together, like crossed swords on the wall, in reach of every eye and hand, symbols of the reason and the cost of our national existence.

Who first worded this compact definition of Democracy? Many a mind helped to fashion it; but it seems to have been Theodore Parker, not Abraham Lincoln, who gave the final cutting and left the perfect gem. And the refusals to accord to Mr. Parker the claim his friends have made for him have thus far curiously made good that claim by missing its very point,—the point being, not who had thought a thought like this nor who had spoken words like these, but *on whose lips did the phrase reach the final concentration* which fitted it to be a nation's household word? The story of that concentration ends in Parker's library. That end is told in a letter which appeared in the St. Paul *Pioneer-Press* last January, written by a lady who lived many years in Mr. Parker's family, one of his nearest companions in study and work. Here is the letter:

BOSTON, Jan. 13, 1879.

"One cannot wish to take from Abraham Lincoln's wreath of fame a single leaf; but truth was very dear to him. Since his use of Theodore Parker's definition of Democratic government, the authorship of that striking phrase has often been attributed to President Lincoln, but all those who were in the habit of hearing Mr. Parker through the last decade of his preaching and lecturing know it to be his emphasized and often-recurring words through that stormy period.

"The idea did not spring at once to his mind in its final perfect conciseness; he had expressed it again and again with gradually lessening diffuseness before he gave the address to the Anti-Slavery Society, May 13, 1854, where it appears thus: 'Of all the people, by all the people, and for all the people,' as published in Additional Speeches, vol. 2, p. 25. But that was not quite pointed enough for the weapon he needed to use so often in criticising the national action, to pierce and penetrate the mind of hearer and reader with the just idea of Democracy, securing it there by much iteration; and I can distinctly recall his joyful look when he afterward read it to me in his library, condensed into this gem: 'Of the people, by the people, for the people.'

"Not a superfluous word there. Those who listened to him week after week in Music Hall would no more doubt the authorship of this phrase than a literary reader would question that of 'To be or not to be.' He was a generous soul, and would not care to claim his own; Mr. Lincoln was as generous, and would not encroach on another's right; but as one who watched, in the intimacy of the study, this crystallization of an expression which has become a household word, and is destined to be permanent, I venture to do justice to both these noble men by stating these facts. Faithfully yours, HANNAH E. STEVENSON."

That was in 1854; but earlier than that, as early as May 29, 1850, in an anti-slavery speech delivered in Boston, the definition had reached on Parker's lips the form quoted above for 1854. And the year before 1850 (Oct. 4, 1849, at Onondaga, N. Y.) he had spoken of ecclesiastical Rome as "a theocracy,—a government of all the people, but by the priests, for the sake of the priests, and in the name of God;" and of the United States, "the government is a Democracy, the government of all, by all, for all, and in the name of all." Probably the words could be found in other approximations in his addresses of still earlier date.

Miss Stevenson's letter went the round of the newspapers and brought out responses suggesting older origins for the famous phrase. One remembered Parker's learned friend, Prof. Gervinus, of Heidelberg. In a book for which he was imprisoned in 1853, Prof. Gervinus had described the revolutionary statesmen of France as men "whose motto is, All *by* the people,—their practice, Nothing *for* the people;" and he had also quoted an expression of the great Napoleon, "All *for* and nothing *by* the people." So our household word came to us from the throne of France, through Germany, this correspondent thought.

Others found it nearer home. Daniel Webster, in his speech upon Foote's resolution, in 1830, had spoken of "the people's government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people." Another did better than that: President Lincoln, it was said, very likely borrowed the sentence from Chief Justice Marshall, who in delivering a judgment, in 1819, used the following language:

"The government of the Union is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and in substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them, and are to be exercised directly on them and for their benefit." In the argument of the same case, Mr. Pinkney, for the plaintiff in error, had said: "The Constitution acts directly *on* the people, by means of powers communicated directly *from* the people. No State, in its corporate capacity, ratified it; but it was proposed for adoption to popular conventions. It springs from the people precisely as the State Constitutions spring from the people, and acts on them in a similar manner."

Then came one who had read an older Chief Justice than Marshall, even old Judge Sewall, of Massachusetts Bay. In his diary for Friday, Nov. 8, 1690 (pp. 333-4), the Judge notes that—

"Jno. Hoar comes into the Lobby and sais he comes from the Lord, by the Lord, to speak for the Lord." The following from Algernon Sydney, published in 1698, was also quoted as interesting in the same connection: "But though every private man, singly taken, be subject to the commands of the magistrate, the whole body of the people is not so; for he is by and for the people, and the people is neither by nor for him."—(*Discourses Concerning Government, p. 457, sec. 36.*)

And, finally, we must not forget the friend who distanced all by promptly writing to a paper to say that "it occurred to me that I had seen the model by which Mr. Parker's compact sentiment was formed, in the New Testament,—Rom. xi., 36: "For of Him and through Him and to Him are all things." Paul's short sentence, as we see, has three prepositions in it; so has Mr. Parker's short sentence, and one of them is the same as one of Paul's. Therefore Paul helped Mr. Parker to write his sentence!

It is not an important, but it is an interesting question to know the ancestry and birth of world-famous phrases; but ancestry and birth are different things, and why do these word-snatchers so confound them? Be it said again, the point is,—on whose lips did an expression long shaping itself reach the final concentration which fitted it to be a nation's household word? To make it such a word, still another pair of lips and a great occasion were needed. The true story of the famous phrase is a story of growth and survival of the fittest,—as with most proverbs probably. "The Government of the people, by the people, and for the people,"—in substance the thought in these words is generations old; it reached its perfect shape in Theodore Parker's library and pulpit; it became historic, a nation's household word, by President Lincoln's use of it at Gettysburg. At least thus stands the record up to now.

THE BIRTH OF JESUS.

J. C. L.

Thirty-eight years ago, Theodore Parker said: "At the present day, Germany seems to be the only country where the various discussions of theology are pursued in the liberal and scientific spirit which some men fancy is peculiar to the nineteenth century." "We state only a common and notorious fact, in saying that there is no *science* of theology with us." "No treatise has been printed in England in the present century of so great theological merit as that of pagan Cicero on the nature of the gods, or the preface to his treatise of Laws. The work of Aristotle, we are told, is still the text-book of morals at the first university of Christian England." "Our philosophy of divine things is the poorest of all our philosophies. It is not a theology, but a despair of all theology." "The ridiculous part of the matter is this—that the man professes to search for whatever truth is to be found, but has sworn a solemn oath never to accept as truth what does not conform to the idols he worships at home." In some departments, very little is to be expected of our labors in America. "We have no libraries that would enable us to verify the quotations in Gieseler; none, perhaps, that contains all the important sources of ecclesiastical history."

Certainly, great changes have come since these words were written. Recently, Dean Stanley credits Parker with having given the strongest impulse to the study of scientific theology in this country. Now, our chief Divinity School appeals to the public for adequate endowment, on the ground that "Here theology is studied as medicine and law, and the facts of nature are studied in the schools devoted to them; that is, in the interest of truth only."

Moreover, a long list of able works can now be cited, conceived and executed in the true spirit of scientific inquiry; if not many so able and thorough as have been produced in Germany, yet certainly not wanting in pains-taking research, freedom from dogmatism, and devotion to truth. A selection of ethical maxims and spiritual insights could be drawn from Emerson and Bartol, comparing favorably with anything in the writings of the past. What author has more profoundly appreciated the problems of ecclesiastical history or religious philosophy than Hedge? Where shall we find more thorough and important treatment of a single theme than in Alger's "History of the Doctrine of a Future Life"? And either of Samuel Johnson's volumes on the religion of China or India would have set aside the sharp criticism of Parker. Others might be named, familiar to all.

One of these latest writers, entering fully into the new spirit of our times, and from whom we have yet much to expect, is Dr. Miles. He has given us a book entitled "The Birth of Jesus." It is a small volume, containing only 211 pages; and yet there is so much in it of careful thought and scholarship, it elucidates so many points of religious controversy, and its clear, simple style so well adapts it to the general reader, that it deserves the widest recognition. As a rule, "The Birth of Jesus" on the title-page of a book could not be counted on to excite any strong emotion in its behalf, even though the author were a Doctor of Divinity. Indifference to the whole matter, or prejudice (orthodox or heterodox), would stand in the way of opening up the question. Yet, if it can be shown how nearly all the controversies and influential doctrines of the church revolve about this one event as their center, sprang from it, and changed only as men changed their views of it

then too much importance cannot be attached to the history of it. Like Johnson's "Worship of Jesus," but in a very different way, Dr. Miles shows how the man Jesus at length became deified in the church. When questions like these arose: "Was his flesh of the same essence as his divinity? Was his body created or uncreated? If uncreated, did it once form a part of the Trinity? If created, when, where and out of what was it made? Was his body corruptible or incorruptible? If corruptible, how could it ascend into heaven? If incorruptible, how could he be said to have assumed human nature? If he was equal to the Father and the Spirit, why was he sent to suffer and die, rather than either of the other persons of the Trinity? Did he suffer in his human nature or in his divine nature, or in both? If he suffered in his human nature alone, where is the infinite atonement? If he suffered in the divine nature, did the Father and Spirit suffer with him? Did he have two wills, or only one will? How can a generated son be equal to an ungenerated father?"—or, if it were asked concerning the nature of the virgin Mary, or how Jesus was saved from the taint of original sin:—orthodoxy always found something in the event of his birth with which to answer, and upon which to base its claims.

Thanks to historic methods of study, we have learned this: that to trace out the origin of an error is the best way to refute it. We must take men back to the beginnings of history to release them from the burdensome falsehoods of a later time. Let them see how traditions were manufactured and imposed or carelessly adopted, and they will be most effectually cured of their authority. There is no hope of a rational Christian theology, no hope of rational views of the character, mission, life and death of Jesus, so long as his birth is buried under a mass of misunderstood or perverted imagery. Whatever throws light, then, upon the gospel story, or shows how the last dogmas of Romanism have been developed out of it, is of value.

Dr. Noyes, of Cambridge, used to express his sense of relief to his pupils when he got through the first two chapters of Matthew. His predecessor, Andrews Norton, left them out of his edition of the New Testament altogether, saying, "There are strong reasons for thinking that the first two chapters of our present copies of the Greek gospel of Matthew made no part of the original Hebrew." Dr. Miles found a singular dearth of discussion on this subject of the miraculous birth of Jesus among modern writers. Only a very summary disposal of the whole question, or an ominous silence, had been offered to meet the difficulties of the modern inquirer. Our author offers this study to supply a real deficiency in our theological literature. "Between a literal acceptance of the stories connected with our Lord's birth and a rejection of them all as fables, critical literature has not yet furnished an accredited middle ground." With a firm but reverent hand, he addresses himself to his task. And we heartily commend his little book to those who are interested in the history and growth of Christian doctrines.

WORSHIP.

M. J. SAVAGE.

I do not believe that worship is on the decline. I believe that it is an eternal necessity of every high, true, pure, noble nature that it should worship, and that it should maintain a worshipful attitude as its habitual one. Any nature that is finite must forever conceive of something above and beyond itself. It is the very condition of growth, the very condition of development, that a man or a woman should conceive of something above and beyond himself or herself. If you want to find the smallest man among your acquaintances, you will seek out the man who is confident that there is nothing in the universe bigger than himself. If you want to find some grand, true and noble soul, you will find him bowed before the mystery and the majesty that he sees in the universe, around and above and beneath him. You will find him a worshipper looking up, looking on; seeing something that has a light and a glory, such as was never on sea or land; seeing something that shames him in his present condition of undevelopment; something that creates in him a feeling of discontent and makes him anxious to strive and press on, in the language of St. Paul, toward some higher work, for some higher prize, for some higher calling. It is a necessity then, I say, of every nature that has in it a possibility of growth, of development, to become something more than and something better than it is to-day; that it should be, in its essential being, a worshipful nature.

But what do we mean by worship? If every true and noble man is a worshipper, and if, as I have said, some of the truest and noblest men of our time are not worshippers in the ecclesiastical or technical sense, what do we mean by worship? The underlying, essential, root idea of all worship can be expressed by one word, and that one word is admiration. The man who admires anything, who looks at it as above him, as better, sweeter, truer, purer, nobler, more beautiful than himself—that man, in his character and after his kind, is a worshipper. The man who bends with love and tenderness over the little flower that he has just plucked from the sod, that sees in it the marvel of the life of the world, that sees how included in its petals is a part of the infinite and eternal mystery of things, who finds his heart rejoicing in its beauty, who finds himself awed by this mysterious somewhat called life manifested in the flower—such a man has in him the element of the grandest and noblest and truest worship. He who looks rapt upon the mountains; or stands upon the mountains and sees the world in its magnificence lying at his feet; or, sitting by the sea shore and listening to the endless roll of the surf; listening to the anthem which the white-fingered waves play upon this endless keyboard of beach—he who listens to the bird's song and feels his heart kindle with the song, that is, all lifted up by higher and sweeter thoughts; he who looks upon some historic deed of the past or some great character of history and feels his soul

kindle in admiration, stimulated to emulate such deeds so far as in him lies; he who stands by the monument of the soldier and admires the consecration and devotion to God, to principle, to truth, which led him to give his life for a principle; any one who, anywhere, looks upon something more beautiful, something nobler, something truer than he feels he has yet been, and feels his heart bowed down by it and his soul lifted up by it, is a worshipper, and a worshipper of God, no matter what he calls it, call it fear, call it friendship, call it love of wife and children, call it patriotism, call it devotion to humanity, call it art, call it science, call it the grandeur of the land or of the sea, call it whatever you will—are not all these the whispers of the Majesty, and the beauty and the infinity of him who is the soul and life of all? When I look upon these things, am I not looking upon the garments of God? am I not looking upon the footprints or the finger-marks of the divine Creator?

Even, then, if there were no God in the common sense in which that word is used; even if there were no personal being sitting on a throne, or living somehow, somewhere at the center of things, being the heart and life and soul; if there is nothing more than we can see about us, nothing more than we can study by the aid of science, nothing more than we can see as the handiwork of art, nothing more than we can read as the history of the grand deeds of old—still worship could not die out, but would find in these things endless food on which to grow—stores of fuel to kindle its pure and everlasting flame. For, consider for a moment—whatever your theory of the universe may be—consider for a moment the wondrous relation in which we stand to it, and the emotions of worship that in any live, true, sympathetic soul must be perpetually called out as we contemplate it. This universe, whatever it be, wherever it come from, whatever its nature—this universe is the manifestation of a mighty life, a mighty force, a mighty power outside of ourselves, above us, beneath us, around us, in which we live and move and have our being. And when you stand and think of these mighty resistless forces, the power of the tempest or the power of the wave, the might of gravitation that sweeps the stars in their courses, before which all our strength is puny weakness itself, must not our souls be overwhelmed at times if we have in us anything of appreciation of that which is grand and mighty—overwhelmed with awe, with a sense of its majesty and magnificence that we cannot express? And then, sometimes, when we remember that out of this system of things has come our life; whether there be a God or not, out of this universe has come our homes, our friends, our husbands, our wives, our children—there has come all that makes life beautiful, all that makes it true, all that makes it holy, all that makes it inspiring—when you think of this, will there not, perforce, sometimes a sentiment of gratitude spring up in your heart, and you feel like giving thanks for all that has been bestowed upon you? And then when you think that in this universe there is stored up the mystery of infinite power and inexplicable resources, and you feel your own want and weakness, and you are hungry or thirsty for some special satisfaction, some favor for yourself or your friends, will there not come a time when, perforce, there will be wrung out of your heart a prayer, a true wish that this bountiful giver should give yet this one thing more? And when you trace the laws of this mighty system of things, and find, as Matthew Arnold has said, from the first until now it has been a power in the universe working for righteousness, a power which, in the long run, has lifted up that which is right and true, and trampled into everlasting infamy that which is evil and wrong, will you not sometimes be awed by the moral majesty and power of the universe, and feel that here is an invisible avenger of law on the track of every wrong, mean thing you have ever done or thought of; and will there not come the desire, on your part, to be reconciled to this great being who is righteous as well as mighty and true? I say, then, whatever your theory of things may be, there is not one element of the religious life, there is not one true and grand manifestation of worship that will not be naturally kindled in any sensitive, true, loving, well-meaning heart, by the simple contemplation of the universe as we see it in its glory and beauty.

[For Unity.]

THE VISION OF TO-DAY.

Behold, O man, "the Living God,"
  But not with form of mortal dress;
No king appears, with sceptred rod—
  No monarch doth the sight oppress;
But as we sit in silent mood,
  There comes to us a thoughtful word,
And by its speech the soul is moved,
  And all its depths of being stirred.

The past was taught, in way like this,
  To know of "God," a Life unseen;
And when was sensed ecstatic bliss,
  The seer was with "the God," I ween;
And so, methinks, the speech that came
  Was what the seer as "God" revered.
It form had none, nor yet a name;
  What else was it that there appeared?

'T is true, the man by speech is known;
  'T is true, we sense a soul divine;
But living Word, not kingly throne,
  Inspires with life this soul of mine!
Too long the earth hath bowed the knee,
  Too long the man been kept by fear;
Behold the God!—a reverie,
  In which "the word" is plain and clear!

No man hath seen a human soul—
  No seer declares the holy name;
But speech divine doth come to all,
  And way of grace doth it proclaim;
And so I say, Behold the God!
  A voice so still, of inward thought;
And while we tread the earthly sod
  Accept the truth that thus is brought.

HEWITT.

NEARING THE SNOW LINE.

Slow toiling upward from the misty vale,
I leave the bright, enameled zones below;
No more for me their beauteous bloom shall glow,
Their lingering sweetness load the morning gale;
Few are the slender flowerets, scentless, pale,
That on their ice-clad stems all trembling blow
Along the margin of unmelting snow.
Yet with unsaddened voice thy verge I hail,
White realm of peace above the flowering line.
Welcome thy frozen domes, thy rocky spires!
O'er thee undimmed the moon-girt planets shine,
On thy majestic altars fade the fires
That filled the air with smoke of vain desires,
And all the unclouded blue of heaven is thine!

—*O. W. Holmes.*

NOTES FROM THE FIELD.

J. LL. J.

BOSTON, MASS.—*Unity Pulpit*, Nos. 1 and 2, a serial publication of Mr. Savage's sermons, from the press of Geo. H. Ellis, published weekly, $1.50 per annum. First course on the "Morals of Evolution." We commend these sermons—living topics in live hands.

NEW YORK CITY.—Rev. James Conner, late a Roman Catholic priest in Chicago, and who afterward co-operated with the Unitarian Society in Cincinnati, has identified himself with the new Reformed Catholic Church in New York, and ministers to a parish of 2,000 souls. The new movement has several ex-priests connected with it, and starts off promisingly.

INDIA.—Speaking of names for the coming church, the Brahmo Somaj of Dargeeling have changed the name of their new building from "Prayer Hall" to "The Temple of God," because it is to be a place of fraternity, of service of man for the love of God. This reminds the *Unitarian Herald* of Robert Falkner's church—of The Divine Service.

CINCINNATI, O.—Mr. Wendte, Oct. 19, held a service of "Thanksgiving for the Harvest," with abundant decorations of flowers, grains and fruits, and appropriate music and sermon. The same day, Mr. Holyoake opened the "People's Course of Sunday Afternoon Lectures," in the Opera House, but under the auspices of the church "Unity Club."

BROOKFIELD, MASS.—There is danger that this town will lose the services of A. J. Rich—pulpit octogenarian (10 years settlement)—as he has received a call to Hyde Park. Should he go, he will leave a united society, containing a ladies' social circle that has raised $1200 in five years, a literary and social club, a dramatic club, a live Sunday-School of one hundred members, of which he is superintendent, and a church out of debt.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Roberts Brothers will publish shortly, "The Faith of Reason," a series of lecture-sermons, by John W. Chadwick, on the leading topics of religion, with reference to current doctrines and discussions. The subjects discussed are, "Agnostic Religion," "The Nature of Religion," "The Idea of God," "Immortality," "Prayer," "Morality." The discourses form a connected series, and are entirely independent of the pamphlet sermons published by Mr. Chadwick. The price of the book will be $1.00.

CONCORD, MASS.—The Summer School of Philosophy, of which A. Bronson Alcott is Dean of the Faculty, is out with its circular for 1880, giving a resume of the work done last summer and the proposed course next summer. The receipts of last year paid all expenses, and it is expected that the number of tickets next year will exceed the number which can be issued. Tickets can be engaged before hand of F. B. Sanborn, Secretary, at above place.

PETERSHAM, MASS.—Another item indicating the busy life of a pastor, even in what might be called "a quiet neighborhood." Lyman Clark, pastor of the First Church, during the five years of his settlement, has preached 322 times, attended 56 funerals, and solemnized 13 marriages. Will some of our lay friends, who think the modern minister eats idle bread, try their hand at writing one sermon, that they may realize how much it costs, even though it be a poor one?

DAVENPORT, IOWA.—The season of the Literary Club is fairly upon us, and Mr. Hunting's Unity Club is the first to present us with its printed programme, neatly printed and clearly arranged, consisting of fifty-four different studies in English Literature of the 18th and 19th Centuries, distributed through twelve evenings. The "Unity Club" work is getting to be a matter of so much real importance in our parishes, that we ought to profit by each other's experience. Please send us your programmes as fast as they are printed.

JANESVILLE, WIS.—An Episcopal minister in this city announces a course of sermons "on the Physical Conditions of a Successful Church." This strikes us as a most suggestive line to work upon, in recognition of which most churches are too neglectful. Now is the time to see to the furnaces, for, if this be neglected, a good sermon will soon be lost upon listeners with cold feet. The treasurer's account book, also, suggests physical necessities too often neglected. A ministerial neighbor always speaks of church funds as "the sinews." Many a good cause has gone down for want of close attention to the same "sinews." It is possible for a church to do good work with rather a poor preacher, but there is no prosperity without a diligent janitor and efficient trustees.

WOMAN'S WORK.—Rev. Antoinette Brown Blackwell has recently preached to the Liberal congregations at Janesville and Kenosha, Wis., very acceptably, and delivered her lecture on the "A B C's of Nature" before the State Institution for the Blind at Janesville, and at Racine. She has other engagements pending. Mary F. Eastman delivered her lecture on, "Do our Schools Educate?" in Janesville and Madison, an able discussion of a most timely topic. Bishop Andrews refused license to Rev. Mary A. Phillips, of Olney, Ill., as not being permissible under the rules for a woman to join the Methodist ministry, whereupon the Presiding Elder and all the preachers of the district have petitioned the General Conference to change the rule.

KEOKUK, IOWA.—The Autumnal Conference of the Iowa Association of Unitarian and other Independent Churches, convenes here Nov. 11–13. The opening sermon will be given Tuesday evening, by R. L. Herbert, of Geneva, Ill. On Wednesday there will be an address by President Clute, essays by Rickards, of Waterville, Kansas; Jones on "Shrines," and S. M. Clarke, of Keokuk, on "Laymen and the Modern Pulpit," and a missionary sermon on "The Spirit of Truth," by the Missionary of the Association, J. R. Effinger, of Des

Moines, in the evening. Thursday, Hunting will discourse on "Limitations," Forbush on "Crime and Criminals," Vila Blake on "Compensation," Snyder on "Do not Sin against the Child," and Ward Lamson, of Fairfield, Iowa, on "Self-Worship." All friends of F., F., C. in R., in all the States, are invited. The hospitality of Keokuk is great. Send names in advance to John Andrew, pastor.

NORTHFIELD, MASS.—A correspondent suggested to UNITY readers, some time ago, that the new church be known as "The Church of the Divine Commandment." Bro. Marsh suggests, as still better, "The Church of Divine Helpfulness," and puts a good deal of the genius and spirit of such a church in a public welcome recently given to one who received from him the right hand of fellowship. He said that, "While formal membership of a Christian church is not essential to one's temporal or eternal welfare, yet it may be a help to the higher life and the development of character. * * Profession is one of the virtues. He who openly professes his desire, thus describes his ideals, and will be less likely to lose sight of them. * * * This right hand which you give and take means to you and to us mutual encouragement, hearty co-operation in building a divine manhood."

EDUCATION.—The success of the "Society to Encourage Studies at Home" has induced Miss E. F. Ware, of Milton Mass., to systematically open a school for "Instruction by Correspondence." The object is to enable young women, who have left school, who are beyond the reach of competent teachers, or who from limited means or domestic duties cannot leave home, to carry on their studies. The method is a system of weekly correspondence, the pupil reporting difficulties and work done, the teacher replying with criticism, information, advice, &c. The subjects include History, English Literature, History of Art, Languages and the Sciences. School year-lasting thirty-six weeks. Fee, $50, payable half-yearly. This strikes us as a novel but eminently sensible and economical method for those who desire real culture. We doubt not but what this is the beginning of a better way. Why must one go away from home in order to think? Miss Ware refers to some of the best men and women in the country. UNITY readers will be interested to know more of this venture.

HOBART, IND.—The old bell must go, to whose cracked voice we were so willing to respond as it summoned us from the belfry of the little Unitarian church here. It was the worst-sounding bell in the West, but then it was home-made. It was coined out of the consecration of Liberal friends in the place. The boys had gathered the cow-bells and had thrown in their brass tops and rings; the little girls threw in their nickels, the women their silver spoons and plate, and the men seasoned the mixture with the "dollars of the fathers" when they were scarce and a rarity; but brother Litchfield found friends down East who had so little poetry in their souls as to give him money enough to buy a new bell, with better tone, 'tis true, but then it is made in the ordinary way, at a *factory*, where bells are turned out by the hundred. Alas! what is to become of sentiment, in the face of such facts? We hope the Hobart friends are not getting proud. Brother Herford lectures to them Nov. 4th; Bro. Cooke, of Indianapolis, exchanges the 9th and lectures the 10th. Other lectures expected. This course is given in the interest of a parish library, already doing good with four hundred donated volumes, and room for more.

INDIANA FRIENDS.—A recent number of *The Journal*, the organ of the Society of Friends, contains an interesting account of the Indiana Yearly Meeting, held at Richmond. A pleasant feature was the reading of letters from kindred associations. The New York Friends urged them not to be discouraged because the work has fallen on a faithful few, since, "in all ages of the world, the effort to promote moral and spiritual progress has ever been made by 'the faithful few.'" Much of the time was spent in discussing the causes of dulness and decay among them. We are impressed, on reading the report, as if we had visited a dyspeptic. Rather too much self-consciousness for health, but many bright and noble utterances crowd into the report, and, with Thomas Foulke, we agree that "the time has not come for this church to pass away—this church that has encouraged a free gospel ministry, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and has made woman equal with man, in the church and in the home." Jesse Wilson testified that "the Society, during the last forty years, has been dominated by its discipline, which has held as much sway over the Society of the Friends as ever the ceremonial law held over the Israelites, and, he feared, with similar results." It is pathetic to read their discussion over the Indian question. It was whether they would not be obliged to withdraw their agents entirely, notwithstanding that most hopeful reports were read from them, and the fact that the Quakers are the only people who have always been successful in their dealings with Indians, on account of obnoxious rulings of the department and repeated indignities offered. The sisters spoke often in meeting, and, we should judge, well. Rebecca Price urged the importance of Friends living within their incomes and the necessity of sweeping before our own door. There must have been a merry twinkle in the eye of Anna Starr, no matter how sober her bonnet may have looked, when she said that Martha was not rebuked for busying herself about her household duties, but for busying herself about Mary.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—Mr. Hosmer has done a real service to liberal thought and religious Unity by preaching and publishing a reply to Joseph Cook's exposition of the "New Birth and the Atonement." Mr. Cook preached in the Presbyterian Church, Oct. 5th, from his favorite text, "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" and on the Sunday following, Mr. Hosmer answered in a discourse clear, kind and very earnest. Of the lecture he said, "It was difficult to feel that we were not listening to a case of special pleading, * * to a man of broad research and scholarship, who was bound already to defend an accepted system. There was that in his bearing which marks the man who has been fed fat with applause, and has become conscious of popularity. * * Cannon Farrar he classed among the 'Misleading Voices,' because he believes in a possible repentance after death. Referred to Boston with that stale and cheap ridicule which tickles the ears of groundlings in a western audience. This Christian knight refers to Herbert Spencer as 'a waning old moon.'" Mr. Hosmer finds an advance, though, in Cook's perdition, which he explained to be a "permanent, free dissimilarity of feeling with God," over Jonathan Edwards' burning pit, over which divine wrath holds the sinner "much as one holds a spider over the fire." Summing up Mr. Cook's discourse, the reviewer says: "Not one word was said of the joy and value of religion to this life; not one plea for a noble and manly life, for its own sake, and because it is in itself a

present and ever-present reward. Piety was put on a commercial basis, and religion treated as an insurance ticket to the heavenly seats hereafter." We wish that this timely word of Hosmer's might be sown broadcast in the wake of this large man, who uses learning to reproach some of the best disciples of learning; who uses thought to make the result of thinking on religious matters disreputable, and who in the name of religion confirms the bigotry and the narrowness that is unreligious.

ENGLAND.—The *Unitarian Herald* says that Rev. Eli Fay, of Sheffield, recently delivered a lecture on "England's Greatest Need," in which he says some things that will surprise his old American friends. He says, "On the whole, an American family does not waste so much as an English family." The criminal wastefulness of English people, high and low, reminds him of his own native country (America) during the prosperity of the ten years succeeding the war. In Sheffield, there is a drinking-shop for every fifty dwelling-houses. English people drink £140,000,000 per annum, and their sports are very expensive and demoralizing. The *Herald* adds that "they play at soldiers to the tune of £30,000,000 per year." Mr. Fay's sermon—"Science, of Course; but What Then?"—preached before the President and other members of the British Association, and published by special request of the President, has already passed through two editions in an expensive form, and the demand has brought out a cheap edition, a part of which we hope may float across the Atlantic, for the benefit of UNITY and its readers. The same paper reports a recent meeting of the Bolton District Unitarian Association, at which Rev. Mr. Franklin thought that none need trouble themselves concerning Agnosticism. Rev. C. C. Coe discovered three kinds of secularists: 1, The prophets, earnest-hearted, sincere men of convictions; 2, Debaters, with but languid interest in anything but argument; 3, Men hostile to religion. To all of these the Liberal church has a sympathetic and helpful word. The missionary method recommended by Rev. E. Turland, is sound advice to pillars of Unity: "Let the first word be Religious, the second Theological;" that is to say, as we understand him, touch verities first, absurdities afterward.

A marble bust of Rev. W. Gaskill has recently been put into the Portico Library, Manchester, in view of his long service to the same.

We have caught a glimpse of the October calendar of Mr. Farrington's church, Manchester. There is something doing on 24 days out of the 31 in his society, prominent among which is the Sunday-School Mutual Improvement Society. Among Mr. Farrington's *reminders* is a line that may well remind others, viz: "The efficiency of this Society will depend entirely on the number of those who will say to themselves, '*Here is something which I mean to help in.*'" Happy would many of us be if we could remind our young people of "an unusual opportunity to learn to sing." In the interests of congregational singing and Sunday-School efficiency, we would call from the shades the old-time singing-master, now well-nigh obsolete. The more accomplished "music-teacher" and "voice-trainer" that has supplanted him does not make his place good. 'Tis well to train solo singers; 'tis not well to neglect chorus voices to sing Ortonville and Old Hundred.

WANTED.

A rich friend or friends, who believe in the West; who believe in Unity, and who believe in the managers of UNITY enough to entrust them with the administration of $1,000 of their money, to be invested in multiplying helps for the Liberal Sunday-School; in bringing out a cheap and at the same time noble Hymn and Tune Book to serve congregational singing, for the weaker societies that cannot afford the more expensive ones already in the market; and to help keep the wheels of UNITY going on its way to self-reliance and permanent usefulness. This advertisement is put in with the most serious intentions, for why should we not advertise for our higher as well as our lower wants? This money is needed to carry on specific plans already matured, which will be submitted in detail to any who are willing to join with us in this work for Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion, by writing to W. C. Gannett, St. Paul, Minn., or Jenk. Ll. Jones, Janesville, Wis.

NOTES.

A good word is circulating from the late Wm. M. Hunt. A young man had criticised Millet for choosing "coarse French clodhoppers" as subjects for his paintings. Hunt indignantly replied: "My God! man, what is nobler than a man wrestling and wringing his bread from the stubborn soil by the sweat of his brow and the break of his back, for his wife and children?"

The *Atlantic Monthly* for November contains a very striking article by Goldwin Smith, on "The Prospects of a Moral Interregnum," predicting that the general "collapse of religious belief" will bring a decline of morality. Other very interesting articles are an anonymous one on "Our Military Past and Future," and one by Col. Geo. E. Waring, Jr., on "The Waldenses of To-day." "Irene, the Missionary," is completed. The remaining contents are: "Sister Mary's Story," by Jane Silsbee; "The Ceramic Art in America," by Jennie J. Young; "English Women in Recent Literature;" "Mysterious Disappearances;" "Late Books of Travel;" "Assorted Americanisms," by Richard Grant White; "The Contributors' Club," and "Recent Literature." Mr. Howells will begin a new serial story in the January number.

According to the *Index*, Felix Adler, recently, "alluding to erroneous reports that had been circulated concerning the objects and scope of the Society for Ethical Culture, said perhaps the most damaging charge was the one that it was an irreligious society. No charge was more unjust than this. There had been a time when scoffs and jeers were the only weapons employed by the skeptic. Perhaps those were necessary then; doubtless the sardonic laugh of Voltaire was needed to wake up the Roman Catholic world, and the crude sledge-hammer blows of a Tom Paine were needed to break the fetters of superstition. Liberalism had passed beyond all that. The true liberalists now believed in the indestructibility of religion in the heart of man. They complained that there was not enough of true religion in the so-called religious systems of the world. How was the spirit of religion to be brought into conformity with the thoughts and feelings of to-day? Instead of belief there was make-believe, and equivocation in religion had become a fine art. There were materialists in the pulpit who preached conservatism to-day and liberalism to-morrow; hucksters, man-sellers, selling themselves. No wonder that persons moved off in distrust and disgust. The members of this society claimed to be true re-

ligionists. To raise persons from imperfection to perfection, was their religion. They wished, not only to obey the laws of morality, but to heighten morality and make it grander than any other ideal. They complained, not only that persons did not follow the standard of morality, but also that the standard of morality was not high enough."

How accurate the "Revised Version" of the Bible is to be, appears in the following from the *Christian Life:* "The translators do not rely upon the merits of their own work for its gaining approval; they do not rely upon scholarship to produce a correct, and, therefore, the desired translation; they rely rather upon the translators having been chosen from all sects, and that it will thus gain acceptance with all. The translators have been chosen in some cases for their rank as ecclesiastics, whether as bishops in the Established Church, or as men of mark among the Dissenters, when scholarship alone should have guided the choice. The translators are a mixed body; most of them scholars, but some merely divines. Nor is that the only way in which undue weight is given to the old errors. It is a fundamental rule in their procedure that no change from the present version is to be made unless two-thirds of the company approve of it."

Here is a good word for UNITY, from T. Starr King: "No sect can command the whole chromatic gamut which the gospel sweeps. Here is the continual call for charity and humility and joy in the comprehensiveness of Christianity. It needs the full choir of churches for its expression. It cannot spare any stop in the organ-growth of history. Each new sect that endures is a new range of pipes, taking up a slighted sentiment, or working some more delicate tone or elaborate variation into the symphony of grace. We shall drop our intellectual differences about trinity and unity, free will and constraining grace, when we reach heaven. But we shall still be ranged, there as here, by the sentiments we most naturally give utterance to. We shall see then, doubtless, what need there is of the utmost power of every party to celebrate the circle of the Divine glory, how deep is the justice, how high the love, how wide the providence, that are twined into the pure harmony of the heavenly hallelujah."

The New York *Tribune*, reviewing Bayard Taylor's "Studies in German Literature," says: "Lessing is described as the first asserter of mental independence in the midst of the stagnation which prevailed at the time of his birth. He was the true pioneer of German thought, and his life was a long and bitter fight for truth, and tolerance, and freedom. The leader of a forlorn hope, he was always armed for the battle, and always confident of victory. Lessing's chief intellectual quality was a passion for truth. This was so earnest, that it was exhibited in the events of his life. Whatever his faults, he was always candid, honest, honorable, and unselfish. He never concerned himself with anything beyond his immediate needs. He gave himself no trouble about the future, and had no longings for literary fame. This rare independence gave his utterances a certainty, even as a young man, which bears no resemblance to egotism. In scholarship, Lessing was far in advance of the theologians of his day. As a religious reformer, his influence has been immense, though it is hardly yet recognized by the world."

C. W. Wendte finds many errors in the methods and spirit of the recent Liberal League Convention. He says: "They plead eloquently for the rights of all creatures, and include even the brute in their sympathy, and then turn around and revile and kick the spiritual mother that bore them—the Christian religion. For even if free religion be an advance on Christianity, the wise radical, the believer in evolution, will recognize that Christianity is the parent of the new faith, and that Christian ideas and practices form by far the larger part of it. The true way, therefore, for such radicals is not to denounce, but to discriminate; not to vilify, but to revere the mother Church, out of which they may have been led by loyalty to the higher vision. Now, the only cure for this ignorance and self-sufficiency on the part of so many radicals, is a larger culture. More knowledge, a better mental training will give the broader view, the more self-controlled and thoughtful temper, and as a natural result of these, a more tolerant and kindly spirit. For this is a second objection which must be brought against the late gathering: the harsh and intolerant manner in which it treated all actual or supposed opponents. While professing to be a Liberal Convention, it was thoroughly illiberal in its temper; exaggerating, misrepresenting, caricaturing the opinions of others and holding them up for ridicule and hate. It made one shudder to think what society would relapse into if the conduct of its affairs were intrusted to such violent and lawless hands."

"Now we are going to have a war with the Utes, which means that during the next three months a few hundred white soldiers will be killed and wounded, peaceable white settlers will be driven from their homes or butchered in them, and Indians (how many of them nobody will care to count) will be shot down like dogs—probably in a grand *battue* of squaws, chiefs and children together, for "our boys" are apt to feel out of humor at the close of a long, tedious campaign, and to pay small attention to differences in sex and age. After the trouble is over, the Utes will be driven out of a reservation to punish them, and the country will have to pay the bill for another costly Indian war. Both sides will lose in money, life and civilization. Nobody will gain a stiver. Yet Indian wars like this have been succeeding each other for a hundred years, one so like another that any of us can lay down the exact programme as soon as the first shot is fired. * * Major Thornburgh was not massacred. He went out to meet the fortunes of war, and was killed instead of killing. The Utes fought, it is true, like savages, and they will continue so to fight as long as we keep them savages. The reason that they fought at all is because they were wronged by whites, and because whites have given them no other mode of redress for their wrongs but the bullet. When we make citizens of these former owners of the country and extend to them the education and protection of the law which the offscourings of European prisons claim among us, we may expect them to conduct themselves like human beings. Certainly justice would be a cheaper experiment than these incessant, costly and inhuman wars."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

O. W. Holmes, writing in the *International*, of Edwin Arnold's new poem, "The Light of Asia," says: "If one were told that many centuries ago a celestial ray shone into the body of a sleeping woman, as it seemed to her in her dream; that thereupon the advent of a wondrous child was predicted by the soothsayers; that angels appeared at this child's birth; that merchants came from afar, bearing gifts to him; that an ancient saint recognized the babe as divine, and fell at his feet and worshipped him; that in his eighth year the child confounded his teachers with the amount of his knowledge, still

showing them due reverence; that he grew up full of compassionate tenderness to all that lived and suffered; that to help his fellow-creatures he sacrificed every worldly prospect and enjoyment; that he went through the ordeal of a terrible temptation, in which all the powers of evil were let loose upon him, and came out a conqueror over them all; that he preached holiness and practiced charity; that he gathered disciples and sent out apostles, who spread his doctrine over many lands and peoples; that this 'Helper of the World' could claim a more than earthly lineage and a life that dated from long before Abraham was—of whom would he think this wonderful tale was told? Would he not say at once that this must be another version of the story of One who came upon our earth in a Syrian village during the reign of Augustus Cæsar, and died by violence during the reign of Tiberius? What would he say if he were told that the narrative was between five and six centuries older than that of the Founder of Christianity? Such is the story of this poem. Such is the date assigned to the personage of whom it is told. The religion he taught is reckoned by many authorities as the most widely prevalent of all beliefs. 'Four hundred and seventy millions of our race live and die,' says Mr. Arnold in his preface, 'in the tenets of Gautama. . . . Forests of flowers are daily laid upon his stainless shrines, and countless millions of lips daily repeat the formula, 'I take refuge in Buddha."'"

Bayard Taylor, in his "Studies in German Literature," praises Luther's translation of the Bible, and says of it: "With all his scholarship, Luther dropped the theological style, and sought among the people for phrases as artless and simple as those of the Hebrew writers. He frequented the market-place, the merry-making, the house of birth, marriage or death among the common people, in order to catch the fullest expression of their feelings in the simplest words. He enlisted his friends in the same service, begging them to note down for him any peculiar, sententious phrase; 'for,' said he, 'I cannot use the words heard in castles and at courts.' Not a sentence of the Bible was translated until he had sought for the briefest, clearest and strongest German equivalent to it. He writes, in 1530: 'I have exerted myself, in translating, to give pure and clear German. And it has verily happened that we have sought and questioned a fortnight, three, four weeks, for a single word, and yet it was not always found. In Job we so labored, Philip Melanchthon, Aurogallus and I, that in four days we sometimes barely finished three lines.'"

An exchange reports that "during a recent trial of a criminal case in Nashville, Tenn., John H. Dix, of the National Liberal League, when about to be sworn as a witness, stated that he did not believe that there was a God, a heaven, a hell, a devil, a future punishment or salvation o the soul. He believed in conscience, and his conscience was his punishment. If he told a lie, he believed his conscience would reproach him as long as he lived. He had never told a lie in his life, never wronged a human being, and was the happiest man on earth. He was asked if he believed in the God of Israel, of Isaac and of Jacob, a Christian God or a Pagan God, and firmly answered, 'No.' Attorney-General Washington explained various beliefs in regard to God and future punishment, and declared that Mr. Dix believed in his conscience as a God. Judge Quarles announced that in view of Mr. Dix's extraordinary statements, he would have to rule out his evidence."

"THE CHILDHOOD OF JESUS"

Is a series of twelve Sunday School Lesson-papers on the following subjects:

I. JESUS' NATIVE LAND.
II. JESUS' PEOPLE.
III. A "CHOSEN NATION."
IV. THE NATION'S DREAM.
V. JESUS' BIRTH.
VI. THE CARPENTER'S FAMILY.
VII. THE COUNTRY-BOY.
VIII. LEARNING TO READ.
IX. THE VILLAGE CHURCH.
X. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM.
XI. THE BOY IN THE TEMPLE.
XII. FROM TWELVE TO THIRTY YEARS OLD.

The series is meant only for scholars over twelve years old and for teachers *willing to work*, as it offers material for class-lessons, not the lessons ready-made. "Lessons I., II., and III." now ready. The others to appear one by one—all, it is hoped, within the present school-year, but they may run into the next. Each about four pages long, with material for two or three Lessons—except "Lesson III." "Lesson III." is a pamphlet of about forty pages, whose better title is, "THE GROWTH OF THE HEBREW RELIGION." It contains material for twenty or more lessons on the Old Testament, arranged with notes and questions for class talks.

The entire series, mailed as the "Lessons" are ready—one set, 30 cts.; five or more sets to one address, 25 cts. each.

"Lesson III." sold separately, one copy, 15 cts.; five or more, 12 cts. each. The other "Lessons" separately, 5 cts. each; five or more copies, 3 cts. each.

"THE GROWTH OF THE HEBREW RELIGION" can also be furnished in a longer form—eight pamphlets, 86 pages in all. (This is the form heretofore, but no longer, issued to subscribers as "Lesson III." Only about 200 copies left for sale.) Its ampler text and notes offer material for a full year's study of the Old Testament. A copy will be of use to a teacher whose class is using the revised abridgment. To prevent mistake, orders should call for it as "Lesson III., the LONGER form." One copy, 40 cts.; five or more, 30 cts. each.

A little CHART (14x9 inches) to go with "Lesson III.," showing the *four strata* in Old Testament literature, with the chief religious events and probable dates of the books in each age. A convenience to fasten in one's Bible. Per copy, 5 cts.

Apply to W. C. GANNETT, St. Paul, Minn.

October, 1879.

1. Dies Hard: If it can be said to ever die, when so much of it is only transmuted and re-christened. Judaism thus retained elements of its own Nature-worship and adopted some of Canaan's; just as early Christianity adopted many rites of old Rome's paganism, which still figure in the Roman Catholic's worship, e. g. the image-worship, relics, tapers, holy water, patron saints, miracles, etc. See B. f. L. i. 104-106.—**2. Native Gods:** See Milton's "Hymn on the Nativity," vv. 22, 23. For Solomon's shrines, 1 Kgs. xi. 4-8, see B. f. L. ii. 83-4. Two sides of the Sun-Power, i. 317-321. Chemosh ("Moabite Stone" described,) ii. 124-6. Molech (child-sacrifice described,) ii. 299. Baal, i. 391. Ashtoreth or Astarte, ii. 300. Asherah ii. 113, 93. Symbols, ii. 87, 113, 167. High places or "bamahs," ii. 104. For Bible glimpses of the worship at these "high places" see 1 Sam. ix. 11-24; x. 5-8; 1 Kgs xviii. 25-29; 2 Kgs. xvii. 7-18.—**3. Split:** 1 Kgs. xii. A State-Rights' secession, as when our South seceded from our North. On map show the two Kingdoms. "Israel" comprised the Samaria and Galilee and Perœa of Jesus' time. 2 Kgs. xvii. 24-34 explains the origin of the feud that gave his parable of the "Good Samaritan" its point.—**4. Bulls:** See B. f. L. ii. 102, 109.—**5. Lost:** But "found" repeatedly,—in China, Hindustan, England, and among our North American Indians!

A traveler in New Zealand found a Maori sage who held the following views of the Christian Bible: "The Bible was a book from Heaven which treated of the New Zealand Natives under figurative language. The Old Testament, in particular, was all about New Zealand. The various people, such as the Hivites and Hittites, found their representatives in the English, German, and Irish people, who had wrongly possessed themselves of the soil. The natives were the true Israel. Auckland was Jerusalem. The Messiah was a Maori, living quietly amongst his people, until the given voice from Heaven should be heard to rouse the nation to recover their rights, destroy their enemies, and rule over a united people from Auckland." But, after all, this application of old Hebrew scriptures to one's land and time, is as many preachers are do outside of New Zealand.

THE GROWTH OF THE HEBREW RELIGION.

BY W. C. GANNETT.

Lesson 5.

KING DAVID AND KING SOLOMON. THE TEMPLE. (ABOUT 1000 B. C.)

Whenever in after-days of woe the people pictured a good time coming, they looked back longingly and said, "The happy days of good King David shall return." He was exalted into a glorious ideal, a saint[20] and knight in one, a Hebrew "King Arthur." In truth, he was much more knight than saint; the saint was of a very unholy order and after a very fierce Jehovah's heart. It is doubtful if he wrote any of the war-psalms, even; scarcely doubtful that he wrote none of the others. But he "feared Jehovah" loyally, and it was he who made **Jerusalem the Holy City,**[21] by making it the capital of the new kingdom and seat of the sacred Ark.

In place of the Ark and its covering tent or "Tabernacle," **Solomon,** his son, built the god a splendid **Temple;** its inner walls were carven cedar overlaid with gold. To this cathedral the people used to bring their lambs and oxen for sacrifice, butchering them by the altar's side and burning the fat as an offering to their god: the meaty smell and smoke would reach and please him in the skies, was the old thought, and the habit lingered long after the old thought died. That was the way that people went to church and said their prayers in ancient time. And Solomon built much besides the Temple,—forts, palaces and ships. The land grew rich and civilized and famous. His tax-gatherers and captains were in all the cities. "He made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones." "Wise as King Solomon,—King Solomon[22] in all his glory!" the people said for centuries of *him.* It was the nation's Golden Age[23]: and all the while, along with his people, the national god grew mightier, grander, and more civilized.

Read "King David Bringing the Ark." 2 Sam. vi. 1-19. (B. f. L. vol. ii. 5-12.)
"King Solomon Building the Temple." 1 Kgs. vi. 11-38. (B. f. L. vol. ii. 84-88.)

20. Saint: Many stories are told of David, some showing his nobler, some his cruel and superstitious, side, e. g. "The Giant-Killer" (1 Sam. xvii.,) "The Generous Foe" (xxvi.) and "The Royal Father" (2 Sam. xviii.;) "The Royal Murderer" (2 Sam. xi. xii.) and "A Famine-Cure" (2 Sam. xxi.) For David's Court, see B. f. L. ii. 22-26, 37. For David's character, see B. f. L. ii. 58-69. How should we judge Bible-heroes and Bible-gods? Force our conscience to admire them because they are Bible-gods and heroes,—or call good, "good," and bad, "bad," wherever found, and remember that the Bible is the record of the *growth* of a religion? What is Bible-worship? What is Bible-smashing? What is justice to the Bible? ——**21. Holy City:** Show a picture of Jerusalem perched on the cliffs of Mt. Zion and Mt. Moriah. *Because* the "Holy City," it has been the victim of a hundred wars.——**22. Solomon:** Matt. vi 29. For his Court and "Wisdom" and Temple, see B. f. L. ii. 69-88.——**23. Golden Age:** Why do we say the "good *old* times," "Spirit of '76," etc? The poet's order is downwards,—Silver, Bronze, Iron, Ages; the historian's is upwards,—Stone, Bronze Iron. See Clodd's "Childhood of the World," part 1.

PART II.

The Prophets, and their Struggle for Jehovah. (1000-500 B. C.)

Lesson 6.

JEHOVAH OR THE IDOLS,—WHICH, IN "ISRAEL?"

But Solomon built shrines for several other gods besides Jehovah. Who were these other gods? The **Country Gods,** whom the Canaanites and their neighbors worshipped. The Hebrews were still far from obeying Moses' first commandment,—Jehovah had become the national god, indeed, but by no means yet the *only* God. It was not strange,—an old religion always dies hard[1]: and the less strange, because the Canaanites and all these neighbor-nations were cousins of the Hebrews, and their gods, if one may say so, were therefore cousins of Jehovah,—that is, all, like him, were special national forms of the Sun-God. One was called *Chemosh;* and one *Molech*,—to him little children were sacrificed as burnt offerings: these, like Jehovah, represented the fierce and flaming side of the Sun-Power. Another was called *Baal;* he represented the more genial and creative side of the Sun-Power. And there were goddesses to match,—*Ashtoreth*, the severe and horned virgin of the Moon, and *Ashera*, a sort of shameful Venus. The altars and images and sacred groves of these old country-gods had stood for centuries upon the hill-tops; and when the Hebrew conquerors began to worship Jehovah in the same "high places," and often with the same symbols, probably few saw much difference between him and the others. Thus it came to pass that Solomon built the Temple for the national Jehovah, but shrines for several of these native gods[2] as well.

And worse soon happened. Hardly had Solomon died when the young **Kingdom Split**[3] **in Two** (about 978 B. C.,)—"Israel" in the north, and "Judah" in the south: and "Israel" fell away at once to idols, state-idols! They were idols of Jehovah, it is true,—gilded Jehovah-Bulls;[4] bulls such as the Hebrews may have worshipped in the old days before Moses. But soon the Tyrian Baal became the court-god and began to steal away the sacrifices from even these Jehovah-Bulls.—Before three centuries were over, idol-worshipping "Israel" had disappeared! The Assyrians from Nineveh had swept down and carried off her people (719 B. C.,)—whither, no one knows. Having no god of their own to separate and mark them as a people, they vanished so completely that they are known in history as the "Lost[5] Tribes."

Read "An Oriental Conquest," and
"Gods of the Land," 2 Kgs. xvii. 6-34. (B. f. L. vol. ii. 241-248, 450-453.)

UNITY.

Published semi-monthly at 75 Madison St., Chicago.

Editor, H. M. SIMMONS.

Business Agent, F. L. ROBERTS.

Publishing Committee. ROBERT COLLYER, W. C. GANNETT, JENK. LL. JONES, C. W. WENDTE, J. C. LEARNED.

TERMS:

One copy, per year $1 50
Ten copies, or more, each 1 25
Single Copies 07

Send money by Registered Letter, P. O. Order, or Draft on Chicago Bank. Drafts, however small, on Banks outside of Chicago, are liable to a charge of 25 cents for cashing.

Address all money and business letters to the office. All editorial communications to H. M. Simmons, Madison, Wis.

UNITY craves a wider field to go about in, doing good. If it be welcome in your home, show it to your neighbor, and send it to your cousin. There is a woman on the next street, and a man down town, who would like to see it. Mail it to that old friend of yours in the village where the three churches make it lonely for a Liberal. Get up a club of ten in your town. Now is the time to subscribe and ask others to

RECEIPTS.

J. W. Willard, $1.25; A. G. Hutchinson, $1.25; R. L. Merrick, $1.25; Charles H. Morgan, $1.25; Rev. A. A. Roberts, $6.25; John Burnham, $2.50; Rev. A. F. Bailey, 2.00; Mrs. Fanny Holy, 50 cents; Wm. Silsbee, $1.50; Ellen Hammond, $1.50; Wm. H. Hunt, $1.50; Mrs. Geo. M. Hord, $1.50; Louis Ballawf, $1.50; H. W. Allen, $1.50.

BOOK DEPARTMENT.

Liberal Books and other publications sent to any address on receipt of regular price.

Introduction to the New Testament, L. A. Sawyer	$2 00
Essentials and Non-Essentials in Religion, Jas. F. Clark. Paper, 25 cents; cloth	50
Theodore Parker's Discourse of Religion, paper	75
Channing's Works, complete in one vol	1 00
Channing's Memoirs	2 50
Translation of the New Testament, Geo. R. Noyes	1 50
Endeavors after the Christian Life, James Martineau	1 00
Studies of Christianity, James Martineau	1 25
Orthodoxy, its Truths and Errors, Jas. F. Clarke	1 25
Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospel, A. Norton	1 50
Letter and Spirit, Richard Metcalf	60
Current Discussions, Questions of Belief	1 50
The Cradle of the Christ, O. B. Frothingham	1 57
Foundation Stones, George Chainey	1 00
The Paradox and Other Poems, J. Albert Wilson	1 00
Fine Arts in Italy, A. Coquerel	2 00
Religion of Israel, A. Kuenen, 3 vols	9 00
Religion of Israel, Knappert	1 00
Bible for Learners, (Old Testament) 2 vols	4 00
The Bible of To-day, J. W. Chadwick	1 50
What is the Bible? J. T. Sunderland	1 00
Hymn and Tune Book, revised edition	1 25
Hymn, Tune and Service Book, revised edition	1 50
The Way of Life, a Service Book, by F. L. Hosmer, single copy, cloth, 50 cents; paper	40
Livermore's Commentaries; Gospels, Acts and Romans, 4 vols	5 00
Christianity and Modern Thought	1 25
Religion and Materialism, by James Martineau,	1 25
Materialism and Theology, by James Martineau,	1 00
Day unto Day, compiled by Mrs. M. L. Bennett	75
Daily Praise and Prayer	1 00
Doctrines of Christianity, by W. G. Eliot,	50
Child's Book of Religion, by O. B. Frothingham	1 00
Childhood of the World, by Edward Clodd, F. R. A. S.	60

WESTERN UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS,

75 Madison Street.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, SUPERINTENDENT.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE.

BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP.

WHEREAS, We feel the great need of rallying the Liberal minds of the West around one common centre; therefore,

Resolved, That the Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all thereto who desire to work with it in advancing the Kingdom of God. (Adopted at Chicago, May 14, 1875.)

NOTICE.

The ministers of the several churches interested in the work of the Western Conference, are urged to remind their societies that the assessments for the year were pledged by January 1, 1880. Now is the time to act while the churches are in their best vigor. Please see report of the Cincinnati Conference in UNITY, June 1, page 109.

On behalf of Committee. JENK. LL. JONES,
Chicago, Oct. 28. 1879. Sec. W. U. C.

WEST. UNIT. SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

THE RULES TO MAKE HOME PLEASANT, referred to in Unity of July 15th, are now ready. They are printed on heavy tinted paper, and are designed for home-walls where there are children. Price 30 cents per doz. or 5 cents per copy

UNITY SERVICES AND SONGS FOR SUNDAY SCHOOLS by J. Vila Blake, single copies, 25 cents; per doz, $2.00; per 100, $10.00; manilla edition, plainer, but more durable, per 100, $8.00.

UNITY LESSONS.

FIRST SERIES—"Corner Stones of Character,"—by Mrs. K. G. Wells. 12 lessons (6 slips). Single sets, 10 cts. 25 sets or more, 5 cents per set. Bound in pamphlet and interleaved for notes—single copies, 15 cts.; per doz, $1.25.

SECOND SERIES—"Home Life,"—by Mrs. Susan I. Lesley and Mrs. E. L. Head. 12 lessons (6 slips). Same forms and prices as above.

THIRD SERIES—"School Life,"—by Mrs. F. B. Ames. 12 lessons (6 slips). Same forms and prices as above.

FOURTH SERIES—"The Growth of the Hebrew Religion"—by W. C. Gannett. About 20 lessons. Appearing in current Nos. of UNITY. Ready completed, in pamphlet, by Oct. 15. Single copy, 15 cts.; 5 or more, 12 cts. each.

A CHART (9x14 inches) to go with Series IV., showing the *four strata* in Old Testament literature, with the chief religious events and probable dates of the books in each age. A convenience to fasten in one's Bible. Per copy, 5 cts.

TOOL CHEST for workers in Liberal Sunday Schools, eight page pamphlet, price 5 cts.

UNITY INFANT CLASS CARDS.

NEW SERIES (C.)—"Corner-Stones of Character,"—12 cards; can be used with Lesson—Series I, above, on "Uniform Lesson" plan. Per package, 20 cts. Photograph, verses, tinted card: the whole very pretty.

SERIES A—"Sayings of Jesus,"—10 cards, illuminated; per package, 15 cts.

SERIES B—"Kindness to Animals,"—10 cards, illuminated; per package, 15 cts.

ANTIOCH COLLEGE,

Yellow Springs, Green Co., Ohio, offers to both sexes thorough instruction, preparatory and collegiate, by an experienced faculty of five professors, in ancient and modern languages, mathematics, the natural and the moral sciences, and literature. Special attention will be given to fitting young men for Harvard or Yale in a three years course. The College is situated in a quiet, beautiful and healthful village, is provided with all necessary buildings and apparatus, and has for its regular preacher a Unitarian minister, thus securing liberal religious services to all who desire to attend them. Total expenses for the year from $150 to $200. Address for catalogue or further information, S. C. DERBY, President.

Entered at the Post Office at Chicago as second class matter.